

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-35 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Kashyap (US 6,944,786). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Applicants will now show that every element of the claimed invention is not identically shown in a single reference, and thus Claims 1-35 are not anticipated by the cited reference.

With respect to Claim 1, it is urged that the cited reference does not teach the claimed features of (1) "identifying a plurality of queue pairs that are members of the multicast group" (the data packet that is receiving including an identifier to such multicast group) or (2) "delivering the data packet to each of the plurality of queue pairs that are members of the multicast group".

In rejecting the 'identifying' step of Claim 1, the Examiner cites Kashyap's teachings at col. 6, line 10; col. 5, line 52 as teaching 'identifying a plurality of queue pairs' and Kashyap's teachings at col. 5, lines 51-56 as teaching 'that are members of the multicast group'. Applicants urge that Kashyap states at cited col. 6, line 10:

"The end node 502 has running thereon processes 504 having associated QPs 506, 508, and 510."

and Kashyap states at cited col. 5, lines 51-56:

"Each process may have associated therewith one or more queue pairs (QPs), where each QP communicates with the channel adapter (CA) 418 of the node 400 to link to the Infiniband fabric, as indicated by the arrow 420. For example, the process 402 specifically has QPs 406 and 408, whereas the process 404 has a QP 410."

As can be seen, none of these passages make any mention of a multicast group, or the specifically recited step of identifying a plurality of queue pairs *that are members of the multicast group*. Rather, these cited passages discuss associating queue pairs with *processes executing within a node* (e.g., see Figure 4). Per the invention of Claim 1, a data packet is received, and this received data packet includes an identifier of

a multicast group, and it is this multicast group for which a plurality of queue pairs are identified that are members of such group. The Kashyap processes, which are associated with queue pairs, are not identified by a received data packet, and thus it is error to equate Kashyap's processes with the claimed multicast group. As to Kashyap's discussion regarding a received packet having a multicast DLID, such packet is sent to each *node* that has joined the group (Kashyap col. 3, lines 22-56; col. 6, lines 44-56). The present invention advantageously allows for identifying specific *queue pairs* that are members of a multicast group such that a received data packet can be delivered to each of such queue pairs. Quite simply, the cited reference associates nodes with a multicast group, whereas Claim 1 goes a level deeper, and identifies specific queue pairs that are members of a multi-cast group. Thus, it is urged that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference as every element of the claimed invention is not identically shown in a single reference.

In rejecting the 'delivering' step of Claim 1, the Examiner cites Kashyap's teaching at col. 5, lines 59-64. Applicants urge that Kashyap states at this cited passage:

"A QP includes a send work queue and a receive work queue that are paired together. In general, the send work queue holds instructions that cause data to be transferred between the client's memory and another process's memory, and the receive work queue holds instructions about where to place data that is received from another process."

As can be seen, this passage describes particulars of a single queue pair that holds instructions. In contrast, Claim 1 specifically recites an active step of delivering a data packet, where the data packet is delivered to each of the plurality of queue pairs that are members of the multicast group. This cited passage provides no such teaching, and in fact makes no mention of any type of data packet delivery, either as claimed or otherwise, and thus it is further urged that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference as there is yet another claimed feature not identically shown in a single reference.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 2-11, 34 and 35 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claims 2-11, 34 and 35 depend upon).

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 12-33 for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has been overcome.

**II. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited reference and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: March 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Duke W. Yee  
Reg. No. 34,285  
Wayne P. Bailey  
Reg. No. 34,289  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorneys for Applicants